

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 23 2010

**RANKIN, HILL & CLARK LLP**

38210 GLENN AVENUE  
WILLOUGHBY, OHIO 44094-7808  
TELEPHONE +1 (216) 566-9700

FACSIMILE +1 (216) 566-9711

E-MAIL khoury@rankinhill.com

FACSIMILE TO COMPANY OR FIRM FACSIMILE TEL. NO. FROM DATE NUMBER OF PAGES (INCLUDING THIS PAGE) RE   PTO Serial No. OUR REF.	Examiner Renee Denega United States Patent and Trademark Office 571-273-8300 Samir S. Khoury August 23, 2010 Three (3) pages U.S. Patent Application for: "EXTERNAL FORCE CONTROL METHOD, EXTERNAL FORCE CONTROL SYSTEM AND EXTERNAL FORCE CONTROL PROGRAM" Serial No. 10/599808; Filed October 10, 2006 10/599808 SAT-16887
---	--

Dear Examiner Denega:

Attached hereto, please find a copy of an Interview Agenda for our telephonic interview scheduled for August 24, 2010 at 10am.

Very truly yours,



Samir S. Khoury

SSK:pa

The documents accompanying this facsimile transmission contain information from the law firm of Rankin, Hill & Clark LLP, which may be confidential or privileged. The information is intended to be for the use of the individual or entity named on this transmission sheet. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the contents of this transmitted information is prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error, please notify us by telephone immediately so that we can arrange for the retrieval of the original documents at no cost to you.

AUG 23 2010

FAX TO: Renee Denega

**INTERVIEW AGENDA****Patent Application Serial No.:** 10/599,808**Interview Date:** August 23, 2010 at 10am (telephonic)**Agenda:**

In the outstanding Office action, independent claims 1, 13, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dohno (EP 1324403). Applicant submits that the Dohno publication does not teach or suggest each and every feature of these claims.

1. Claim 1

The Dohno publication discloses adjusting an assisting force AF (an external force) applied to a thigh of a human body via a support 10 according to a relational expression using the output of a thigh sensor as a variable. However, the Dohno publication only discloses setting the assisting force AF (e.g., an external force) to be less than a human force HF by a constant amount. In other words, the Dohno publication does not disclose setting a factor which is a ratio of the assisting force AF (the external force of claim 1) to the sum of the assisting force AF and the human force HF (the resultant force of the external and internal forces of claim 1), as is required by the "factor setting step" of claim 1.

Further, the Dohno publication also does not disclose a comparison between a set factor and a target factor, nor does the Dohno publication disclose setting a new external force function if the difference between the set and target factors is equal to or greater than a reference value. Specifically, as Dohno does not disclose setting a factor (e.g., the ratio as defined by claim 1), Dohno has no reason to compare the factor to a target value, as is required by claim 1. As the comparison of the set value for the factor with the target value is recited by claim 1, the Dohno publication does not teach or suggest this feature.

FAX TO: Renee Denega

---

With respect to the external force function setting step of claim 1, it is noted that a new external force function is set (when the set and target values for the factor sufficiently deviate from one another) "in such a way that the set value of the factor  $\gamma$  approaches the target value  $\gamma_t$ ". The Dohno publication discloses that the assisting force AF is to remain a constant value less than the human force HF. As such, the method disclosed by the Dohno publication does not try to maintain any set ratio of assisting force to total force (e.g.,  $AF/AF+HF$ ), nor does the Dohno method alter the assisting force AF to maintain or approach any target ratio (e.g., the factor of claim 1). For example, with reference to the graph of Fig. 6 in the Dohno publication, assuming a constant difference between the human force HF and the assisting force AF is set at a value of 2 (units not used in graph), and the human force HF increases from a value of 5 to a value of 7, the ratio of assisting force AF to total force ( $AF + HF$ ) changes, by design, from  $3/8$  ( $AF = 3$ ,  $AF + HF = 8$ ) to  $5/12$  ( $AF = 5$ ,  $AF + HF = 12$ ).

For the above reasons, claim 1 is considered allowable over the art.

## II. Claims 13 and 14

Claim 13 and 14 are independent claims which recite features similar to those of claim 1. As such, the arguments presented above in favor of the patentability of claim 1 are considered relevant to the patentability of claims 13 and 14. Accordingly, claims 13 and 14 are considered allowable over the art.